Case: 23-15285, 08/29/2023, ID: 12783182, DktEntry: 122, Page 1 of 8

No. 23-15285

ORAL ARGUMENT SCHEDULED FOR SEPTEMBER 11, 2023

IN THE

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION MARY CARR, ET AL. V. GOOGLE LLC, ET AL.

Interlocutory Appeal from the
United States District Court for the Northern District of California
No. 21-md-2981; No. 20-cv-5761
District Judge James Donato

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANTS' MOTION FOR LIMITED REMAND UNDER FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 12.1(b) AND TO REMOVE THIS CASE FROM THE ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR FOR SEPTEMBER 11, 2023

Katherine B. Wellington HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 125 High St., Suite 2010 Boston, MA 02110

Neal Kumar Katyal Jessica L. Ellsworth HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 555 Thirteenth Street NW Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: (202) 637-5600 Facsimile: (202) 637-5910 neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

Counsel for Defendants-Appellants

August 29, 2023

(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page)

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1(a), Defendants-Appellants state as follows:

Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company holds more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Payment Corp. is a subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company holds more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Commerce Ltd. is an indirect subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company owns more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Ireland Limited is an indirect subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc., a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company owns more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

Google Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd. is an indirect subsidiary of Google LLC. Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc.,

Case: 23-15285, 08/29/2023, ID: 12783182, DktEntry: 122, Page 3 of 8

a publicly traded company; no publicly traded company owns more than 10% of Alphabet Inc.'s stock.

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal Neal Kumar Katyal The parties agree on what should happen in this Court now: This Court should issue a limited remand, with this Court retaining jurisdiction, under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 12.1, and it should remove the case from the imminent September 11, 2023 argument calendar.

Plaintiffs indicate (at 1) that, on remand, they will ask the District Court to exercise "discretion after hearing from the parties" to diverge from the District Court's indicative ruling in the "Order re Decertification and Class Notice," where it stated that "the order granting certification should be vacated." ECF 589. But the plain language of the District Court's indicative ruling is a clear expression of the District Court's intent as to how it would rule if it had authority to do so, and this Court should issue a limited remand order so that the District Court can take action consistent with that clear intention. Given Plaintiffs' suggestion that they may oppose decertification, the Court should also retain jurisdiction as contemplated by Rule 12.1 until the District Court has ruled.

In addition, Google disagrees with Plaintiffs' suggestion (at 2) that this Court should dismiss this appeal "[o]nce the District Court takes further steps in accordance with its orders" unless the further step taken by the District Court is to decertify the class. This Court does not need to take up the question of next steps in this appeal, however, until the District Court has ruled and Google has notified this Court of the ruling. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 12.1(b) (discussing this procedure).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and those in Google's motion, Google respectfully requests that this Court issue a limited remand, while retaining jurisdiction, so that the District Court can decertify the class as contemplated by its August 28, 2023, order. Google also requests that this Court remove this case from the upcoming oral argument calendar set for Monday, September 11, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

August 29, 2023

Katherine B. Wellington HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 125 High St., Suite 2010 Boston, MA 02110 Telephone: (617) 702-7745

Facsimile: (617) 371-1037 katherine.wellington@hoganlovells.com

Brian C. Rocca Sujal J. Shah Michelle Park Chiu

Minna Lo Naranjo Rishi P. Satia

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105

Telephone: (415) 442-1000 Facsimile: (415) 422-1001 brian.rocca@morganlewis.com

Richard S. Taffet

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

101 Park Avenue New York, NY 10178

Telephone: (212) 309-6000

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal

Neal Kumar Katyal Jessica L. Ellsworth HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 555 Thirteenth Street NW Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: (202) 637-5600

Facsimile: (202) 637-5910 neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

Kyle W. Mach Justin P. Raphael

Emily C. Curran-Huberty

MUNGER, TOLLES, & OLSON LLP

560 Mission Street Twenty Seventh Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 512-4000 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077 kyle.mach@mto.com

Glenn D. Pomerantz Kuruvilla Olasa

MUNGER, TOLLES, & OLSON LLP

350 South Grand Avenue

Fiftieth Floor

Facsimile: (212) 309-6001

richard.taffet@morganlewis.com

Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: (213) 683-9100 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077 glenn.pomerantz@mto.com

Counsel for Defendants-Appellants

Case: 23-15285, 08/29/2023, ID: 12783182, DktEntry: 122, Page 7 of 8

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This motion complies with the type-volume limitations of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2)(C) and 9th Circuit Rule 27-1 because it contains 317 words, excluding the parts of the motion exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(a)(2)(B).

This motion complies with the typeface and typestyle requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(1)(E) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word for Office 365 in Times New Roman 14-point font.

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal Neal Kumar Katyal Case: 23-15285, 08/29/2023, ID: 12783182, DktEntry: 122, Page 8 of 8

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on August 29, 2023, the foregoing was electronically filed through this Court's CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of filing to all registered users.

/s/ Neal Kumar Katyal Neal Kumar Katyal